

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re DYNAMIC RANDOM ACCESS
MEMORY (DRAM) ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

No. M 02-1486 PJH

This Document Relates to:
All Direct Purchaser Actions

**SECOND ORDER RE PAGE LIMIT
RE OPPOSITION TO NANYA
DEFENDANTS' DISPOSITIVE
MOTIONS**

Before the court is a letter filed today by counsel for the direct purchaser plaintiffs, requesting that the court reconsider its prior order regarding the page limitations applicable to plaintiffs' proposed opposition briefs in response to the Nanya defendants' summary judgment motions. Plaintiffs now seek to file one consolidated opposition brief no less than 45 pages in length.

After reviewing counsel's request, the court remains unpersuaded that good cause exists for plaintiffs to file one 45 page opposition brief (which is not significantly less than the 50 page limit rejected by the court in its prior order). Given the number of motions filed by all the parties, it is simply more efficient for the court to review two regular opposition briefs of normal length filed in response to two opening briefs. As the court previously stated, it would be inclined to allow plaintiffs to file a consolidated and extended opposition brief, only if doing so would provide a significant advantage to the court in terms of efficiency. Whereas a 35 page opposition brief would provide such an advantage, a 45 page opposition brief would not. Nor is there any reason submitted by plaintiffs' counsel that convinces the court otherwise. Accordingly, the court's prior order stands.

1 Plaintiffs are limited to the filing of either (a) two regular length opposition briefs; or (b) one
2 35 page opposition brief.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: November 13, 2006



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge